

1 Transpiration in an oil palm landscape: effects of palm age

2
3 A. Röhl ^{1*}, F. Niu ^{1*}, A. Meijide ², A. Hardanto ^{1,3}, Hendrayanto ⁴, A. Knohl ², and
4 D. Hölscher ¹

5
6
7 [1]{Tropical Silviculture and Forest Ecology, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen,
8 Germany}

9 [2]{Bioclimatology, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany}

10 [3]{Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia}

11 [4]{Department of Forest Management, Institut Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia}

12 [*]{The authors contributed equally to this work}

13 Correspondence to: A. Röhl (aroell@gwdg.de)

15 Abstract

16 Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) plantations cover large and continuously increasing areas
17 of humid tropical lowlands. Landscapes dominated by oil palms usually consist of a mosaic of
18 mono-cultural, homogeneous stands of varying age, which may be heterogeneous in their
19 water use characteristics. However, studies on the water use characteristics of oil palms are
20 still at an early stage and there is a lack of knowledge on how oil palm expansion will affect
21 the major components of the hydrological cycle. To provide first insights into hydrological
22 landscape-level consequences of oil palm cultivation, we derived transpiration rates of oil
23 palms in stands of varying age, estimated the contribution of palm transpiration to
24 evapotranspiration, and analyzed the influence of fluctuations in environmental variables on
25 oil palm water use. We studied 15 two- to 25-year old stands in the lowlands of Jambi,
26 Indonesia. A sap flux technique with an oil palm specific calibration and sampling scheme
27 was used to derive leaf-, palm- and stand-level water use rates in all stands under comparable
28 environmental conditions. Additionally, in a two- and a 12-year old stand, eddy covariance
29 measurements were conducted to derive evapotranspiration rates. Water use rates per leaf and

1 palm increased 5-fold from an age of two years to a stand age of approx. 10 years and then
2 remained relatively constant. A similar trend was visible, but less pronounced, for estimated
3 stand transpiration rates of oil palms; they varied 12-fold, from 0.2 mm day⁻¹ in a 2-year old
4 to 2.5 mm day⁻¹ in a 12-year old stand, showing particularly high variability in transpiration
5 rates among medium-aged stands. Comparing sap flux and eddy-covariance derived water
6 fluxes suggests that transpiration contributed 8% to evapotranspiration in the 2-year old stand
7 and 53% in the 12-year old stand, indicating variable and substantial additional sources of
8 evaporation, e.g. from the soil, the ground vegetation and from trunk epiphytes. Diurnally, oil
9 palm transpiration rates were characterized by an early peak between 10 and 11 am; there was
10 a pronounced hysteresis in the leaf water use response to changes in vapor pressure deficit for
11 all palms of advanced age. On the day-to-day basis this resulted in a relatively low variability
12 of oil palm water use regardless of fluctuations in vapor pressure deficit and radiation. We
13 conclude, that oil palm dominated landscapes show some spatial variations in
14 (evapo)transpiration rates, e.g. due to varying age-structures, but that the temporal variability
15 of oil palm transpiration is rather low. The stand transpiration of some of the studied oil palm
16 stands was as high or even higher than values reported for different tropical forests, indicating
17 a high water use of oil palms under yet to be explained site or management conditions. Our
18 study provides first insights into the eco-hydrological characteristics of oil palms as well as a
19 first estimate of oil palm water use across a gradient of plantation age. It sheds first light on
20 some of the hydrological consequences of the continuing expansion of oil palm plantations.

21

22 **Key words:** Chrono-sequence, evapotranspiration, eddy covariance, sap flux, Granier-type
23 thermal dissipation probes

24

25 **1 Introduction**

26 Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) has become the most rapidly expanding crop in tropical
27 countries over the past decades, particularly in South East Asia (FAO, 2014). Besides from
28 losses of biodiversity and associated ecosystem functioning (e.g. Barnes et al., 2014),
29 potentially negative consequences of the expansion of oil palm cultivation on components of
30 the hydrological cycle have been reported (e.g. Banabas et al., 2008). Only few studies have
31 dealt with the water use characteristics of oil palms so far (Comte et al., 2012). Available
32 evapotranspiration estimates derived from micrometeorological or catchment-based
33 approaches range from 1.3 to 6.5 mm day⁻¹ for different tropical locations and climatic

1 conditions (e.g. Radersma and Ridder, 1996; Henson and Harun, 2005). However, various
2 components of the water cycle under oil palm yet remain to be studied for a convincing
3 hydrological assessment of the hydrological consequences of oil palm expansion, e.g.
4 regarding the partitioning of the central water flux of evapotranspiration into transpirational
5 and evaporative fluxes. Also, to our knowledge, influences of site or stand characteristics on
6 oil palm water use have not yet been addressed.

7 Landscapes dominated by oil palms are not necessarily homogeneous in their water use
8 characteristics. Oil palms are usually planted in mono-specific and even-aged stands;
9 commonly, stands are cleared and replanted at an age of approx. 25 years due to difficulties in
10 harvesting operations, potentially declining yields and the opportunity to plant higher yielding
11 varieties of oil palm. This creates a mosaic of stands of varying age, and hence with possibly
12 different hydrological characteristics.

13 Substantial differences in transpiration rates of dicot tree stands have been shown for stands
14 of varying age in several studies (e.g. Jayasuriya et al., 1993; Roberts et al., 2001; Vertessy et
15 al., 2001; Delzon and Loustau, 2005); commonly, water use increases rapidly after stand
16 establishment, reaching a peak after some decades (which is associated with high stand
17 productivity and high stand densities) before declining more or less consistently with
18 increasing age. This has e.g. been demonstrated for *Eucalyptus regnans* F. Muell. (Cornich
19 and Vertessy, 2001), *Eucalyptus sieberi* L. Johnson (Roberts et al., 2001) and *Pinus pinaster*
20 Aiton (Delzon and Loustau, 2005) for stands between 10 and 160 years old. Declines in
21 transpiration rates in older stands were mainly explained by decreasing leaf and sapwood area
22 with increasing stand age (Roberts et al., 2001; Vertessy et al., 2001; Delzon and Loustau,
23 2005). This may not be the case in palms, as at least at the individual level, for two
24 Amazonian palm species (*Iriartea deltoidea* Ruiz & Pav. and *Mauritia flexuosa* L.) linear
25 increases of water use with increasing height, and hence age, have been demonstrated
26 (Renniger et al., 2009; Renninger et al., 2010).

27 Water use patterns over a gradient of plantation age to our knowledge have not yet been
28 studied for oil palms. Water use could increase or decline with increasing stand age or could
29 remain relatively stable from a certain age. Reasons for declining water use at a certain age
30 include decreasing functionality of trunk xylem tissue with increasing age due to the absence
31 of secondary growth in monocot species (Zimmermann, 1973), a variety of other hydraulic
32 limitations (see review of dicot tree studies in Ryan et al., 2006) and increased hydraulic
33 resistance due to increased pathway length with increasing trunk height (Yoder et al., 1994).

1 However, for Mexican fan palms (*Washingtonia robusta* Linden ex André H Wendl.), no
2 evidence of increasing hydraulic limitations with increasing palm height was found
3 (Renninger et al., 2009). Reasons for potentially increasing water use in older plantations e.g.
4 include linearly increasing oil palm trunk height with increasing palm age (Henson and
5 Dolmat, 2003). As trunk height and thus volume increase, internal water storages probably
6 also increase, possibly enabling larger (i.e. older) oil palms to transpire at higher rates
7 (Goldstein et al., 1998; Madurapperuma et al., 2009). Additionally, increased stand canopy
8 height is expected to result in an enhanced turbulent energy exchange with the atmosphere,
9 i.e. a closer coupling of transpiration to environmental drivers, which can facilitate higher
10 transpiration rates under optimal environmental conditions (Hollinger et al., 1994; Vanclay,
11 2009). The mentioned reasons for possibly increasing and decreasing water use with
12 increasing plantations age, respectively, could also partly outbalance each other, or could be
13 outbalanced by external factors (e.g. management related), potentially leading to relatively
14 constant oil palm transpiration with increasing plantation age.

15 To investigate the water use characteristics of oil palm stands of varying age, we derived leaf-
16 , palm- and stand-scale transpiration estimates from sap flux density measurements with
17 thermal dissipation probes (TDP; Granier, 1985) in 15 different stands (2–25 years old) in the
18 lowlands of Jambi, Sumatra, Indonesia. We used the oil palm specific calibration equation
19 and field measurement scheme recently proposed by Niu et al. (2015). Additionally, in two of
20 these stands (two and 12 years old) we used the eddy covariance technique (Baldocchi, 2003)
21 to derive independent estimates of evapotranspiration rates. For comparative purposes, the
22 measurements were conducted under similar environmental conditions and partly
23 simultaneously. Our objectives were (1) to derive transpiration rates of oil palms in stands of
24 varying age, (2) to estimate the contribution of palm transpiration to total evapotranspiration,
25 and (3) to analyze the influence of micro-meteorological drivers on oil palm water use. The
26 study provides some first insights into the eco-hydrological characteristics of oil palms at
27 varying spatial (i.e. from leaf to stand) and temporal (i.e. from hourly to daily) scales as well
28 as first estimates of oil palm stand transpiration rates and their contribution to total
29 evapotranspiration. It assesses some of the potential hydrological consequences of oil palm
30 expansion on main components of the water cycle at the stand level.

31

1 **2 Methods**

2 **2.1 Study sites**

3 The field study was conducted in Jambi, Sumatra, Indonesia (Fig. 1). Between 1991 and
4 2011, average annual temperature in the region was 26.7 ± 0.2 °C (1991–2011 mean \pm SD),
5 with little intra-annual variation. Annual precipitation was 2235 ± 385 mm, a dry season with
6 less than 120 mm monthly precipitation usually occurred between June and September.
7 However, the magnitude of dry season rainfall patterns varied highly between years (data
8 from Airport Sultan Thaha in Jambi). Soil types in the research region are mainly sandy and
9 clay Acrisols (Allen et al., 2015). We had research plots in a total of 15 different oil palm
10 stands (Table 1), 13 of which were small holder plantations and two of which were properties
11 of big companies. The stands were spread over two landscapes in the Jambi province (i.e. the
12 Harapan and Bukit Duabelas regions, Fig. 1), were all at similar altitude ($60 \text{ m} \pm 15 \text{ m a.s.l.}$)
13 and belonged to the larger experimental set-up of the CRC990 ([www.uni-](http://www.uni-goettingen.de/crc990)
14 [goettingen.de/crc990](http://www.uni-goettingen.de/crc990), Drescher et al., in preparation). Stand age ranged from 2 to 25 years.
15 Management intensity and frequency (i.e. fertilizer and herbicide application, manual and
16 chemical weeding of ground vegetation and clearing of trunk epiphytes) varied considerably
17 among the examined oil palm stands, but both were generally higher in larger plantations,
18 particularly in PTPN6.

19 **2.2 Sap flux measurements and transpiration**

20 Following a methodological approach for sap flux measurements on oil palms (Niu et al.,
21 2015), we installed thermal dissipation probe (TDP, Granier, 1985; Uniwerkstätten
22 Universität Kassel, Germany; see Niu et al. 2015 for technical specifications) sensors in the
23 leaf petioles of 16 leaves, four each on four different palms, for each of the 15 examined
24 stands. Insulative materials and aluminum foil shielded the sensors to minimize temperature
25 gradients and reflect radiation. Durable plastic foil was added for protection from rain. The
26 sensors were connected to AM16/32 multiplexers connected to a CR1000 data logger (both
27 Campbell Scientific Inc., Logan, USA). The signals from the sensors were recorded every 30
28 sec and averaged and stored every 10 min. The mV-data from the logger was converted to sap
29 flux density ($\text{g cm}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$) with the empirically-derived calibration equation by Granier (1985),
30 but with a set of equation parameters *a* and *b* that was specifically derived for TDP
31 measurements on oil palm leaf petioles (Niu et al., 2015).

1 Individual leaf water use rates were calculated by multiplying respective sap flux densities
2 (e.g. hourly averages, day sums) by the water conductive areas of the leaves; the water use
3 values of all individual leaves measured simultaneously (min. 13 leaves) were averaged (kg
4 day⁻¹). To scale up to average palm water use (kg day⁻¹), average leaf water use rates were
5 multiplied by the average number of leaves per palm. Multiplying the average palm water use
6 by the number of palms per unit of land (m²) yielded stand transpiration rates (T ; mm day⁻¹).

7 The sap flux measurements were conducted between April 2013 and December 2014, for a
8 minimum of 3 weeks per study plot (Table 1). Three of the plots (BO3, PA, and PTPN6) ran
9 over several months, partly in parallel to other plots. Most measurements, however, were
10 conducted successively and thus partly took place under varying weather conditions. Thus, to
11 minimize day-to-day variability introduced by varying weather for the analysis of effects of
12 stand age on water use at different spatial scales, we used the average of three comparably
13 sunny and dry days from the measurement period of each stand. Exploratory analyses had
14 shown that unexplained variability was lower on sunny days than e.g. on cloudy or
15 intermediate days or when using the averages of the full respective measurement periods. We
16 chose days with a daily integrated radiation of more than 17 MJ m⁻² day⁻¹ and an average
17 daytime VPD of more than 1.1 kPa; respective averages (mean ± SD) of all days included in
18 the analysis were 20.3 ± 2.6 MJ m⁻² day⁻¹ and 1.6 ± 0.3 kPa (also see Table 1).

19 **2.3 Stand structural characteristics**

20 For all sample leaves, the leaf petiole baseline length was measured between upper and lower
21 probe of each TDP sensor installed in the field; this allowed calculating the water conductive
22 area of each leaf (Niu et al., 2015). For each sample palm, trunk height to the youngest leaf
23 (m) and diameter at breast height (cm) were measured (see Kotowska et al., 2015 for detailed
24 methodology) and the number of leaves per palm was counted. Over time, new leaves
25 emerged and old ones were pruned by the farmers; we assumed the number of leaves per palm
26 to be constant over our measurement period. On the stand level, we counted the number of
27 palms per hectare.

28 **2.4 Eddy covariance measurements and evapotranspiration**

29 The eddy covariance technique (Baldocchi, 2003) was used to measure evapotranspiration
30 (E_T , mm day⁻¹) in two of the 15 oil palm stands, the 2-year-old (PA) and the 12-year-old
31 (PTPN6) stand (Table 1). Towers of 7 m and 22 m in height, respectively, were equipped with
32 a sonic anemometer (Metek uSonic-3 Scientific, Elmshorn, Germany) to measure the three

1 components of the wind vector, and an open path carbon dioxide and water analyzer (Li-
2 7500A, Licor Inc., Lincoln, USA) to derive evapotranspiration rates (Meijide et al., in
3 preparation). Fluxes were calculated with the software EddyPro (Licor Inc), planar-fit
4 coordinate rotated, corrected for air density fluctuation and quality controlled. Thirty-minute
5 flux data were flagged for quality applying the steady state and integral turbulence
6 characteristic tests (Mauder and Foken, 2006). Data were also filtered according to friction
7 velocity to avoid the possible underestimation of fluxes in stable atmospheric conditions. Due
8 to the amount of data gaps created by lack of power and instrument failure, in the two year-
9 old plantation we calculated the energy balance closure for the selected three sunny days
10 included in the analysis (see Table 1), for which it was 82%. In the 12 year-old stand, the
11 energy balance closure for the respective full measurement period (May 2014-February 2015)
12 was 84%. We selected days when most of the thirty-minute measurements during the day
13 were available. When a single thirty-minute value was missing, the value was filled by linear
14 interpolation between the previous and the next 30 min value. Measurements were conducted
15 between July 2013 and February 2014 in the 2-year old and from May 2014 to February 2015
16 in the 12-year old stand. For the analysis, we used the average of the same three sunny days
17 that were selected for the sap flux analysis in the respective plots (see Table 1). Daytime
18 (6am–7pm) evapotranspiration rates were used for the analyses and comparison to
19 transpiration rates in order to avoid possible measurement errors as a consequence of low
20 turbulent conditions during nighttime hours.

21 To estimate the contribution of stand transpiration to total evapotranspiration, we confronted
22 sap flux derived transpiration rates with eddy covariance derived evapotranspiration rates. As
23 described in Niu et al. (2015), our methodological approach for estimating transpiration is
24 associated with sample size related measurement errors of about 14%. The eddy covariance
25 measurements were carried out in carefully-chosen and well-suited locations and focused on
26 daytime observations only, when estimation uncertainties are commonly low (< 30%,
27 Richardson et al., 2006). The observed differences between evapotranspiration and
28 transpiration estimates presented in this study are thus likely largely due to natural rather than
29 methodological reasons.

30 **2.5 Environmental drivers of oil palm water use**

31 A total of three micrometeorological stations were set up in proximity to the oil palm stands
32 in both landscapes; for the analysis of the water use characteristics of the respective stands,
33 we used the micrometeorological data from the closest available station, at a maximum

1 distance of approx. 15 km and at similar altitude ($60 \text{ m} \pm 15 \text{ m a.s.l.}$). The stations were
2 placed in open terrains. Air temperature and relative humidity were measured at a height of 2
3 m with a Thermohygrometer (type 1.1025.55.000, Thies Clima, Göttingen, Germany) to
4 calculate vapor pressure deficit (VPD, kPa). A short wave radiation sensor (CMP3
5 Pyranometer, spectral range 300–2800 nm, Kipp & Zonen, Delf, The Netherlands) was
6 installed at a height of 3 m, the latter to measure global radiation (R_g , $\text{MJ m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$, from here
7 on referred to as “radiation”). Measurements were taken every 15 sec and averaged and stored
8 on a DL16 Pro data logger (Thies Clima) every 10 min.

9 The eddy covariance towers (see eddy covariance measurements and evapotranspiration) were
10 also equipped with micrometeorological sensors. Measurements were taken above the canopy,
11 at respective heights of 6.7 and 22 m. Air temperature and humidity (Thermohygrometer, type
12 1.1025.55.000, Thies Clima), short wave radiation (BF5, Delta-T, Cambridge, United
13 Kingdom) and net radiation (CNR4 Net radiometer, Kipp & Zonen) were measured every 15
14 sec and averaged and stored on a DL16 Pro data logger (Thies Clima) every 10 min.

15 Soil moisture was recorded in the center of eight of the 15 study plots and at the
16 micrometeorological stations and eddy covariance towers. Soil moisture sensors (Trime-Pico
17 32, IMKO, Ettlingen, Germany) were placed 0.3 m under the soil surface and connected to a
18 data logger (LogTrans16-GPRS, UIT, Dresden, Germany). Data were recorded every hour,
19 for 16 months from June 2013 on. Exploratory analyses showed no significant effects of soil
20 moisture on water use rates (linear regression, $P > 0.1$). Soil moisture fluctuated only little at
21 the respective locations and during the respective measurement periods and even on a yearly
22 scale, e.g. between $32 \pm 2\%$ and $38 \pm 2\%$ between June 2013 and June 2014 (minimum and
23 maximum daily values, mean \pm SE between the three micrometeorological stations). Soil
24 moisture did e.g. also not fall below 36% during the measurement period in the long-term
25 monitoring (BO3) stand. It was non-limiting for plant water use. As it showed no significant
26 relationship with water use rates, we omitted soil moisture from further analyses of influences
27 of fluctuations in environmental variables on oil palm water use. Likewise, further recorded
28 micrometeorological variables (e.g. air pressure, wind speed) had no significant relationship
29 with water use rates in our study (linear regression, $P > 0.1$) and were thus also omitted. We
30 instead focused on the micrometeorological drivers VPD and global radiation; among an array
31 of micrometeorological variables (e.g. also including temperature, humidity, net radiation)
32 exploratory analysis had shown that they were best suited to explain fluctuations in water use
33 rates. This has also been demonstrated in other studies on plant water use (e.g. Dierick and
34 Hölscher, 2009; Köhler et al., 2009, 2013)

1 For the diurnal analysis, we averaged the values of three comparably sunny days and
2 normalized VPD and radiation by setting the highest observed hourly rates to one. All
3 statistical analyses and graphing were performed with R version 3.1.1 (R Core Development
4 team, 2014) and Origin 8.5 (Origin Lab, Northampton, MA, USA).

5

6 **3 Results**

7 **3.1 Stand characteristics**

8 The number of palms per unit of land linearly decreased with increasing stand age ($R^2 = 0.29$,
9 $P = 0.04$; Fig. 2a). The number of leaves per palm remained constant and varied little (32–40
10 leaves per palm) over stand age (Fig. 2b). The trunk height of oil palms (Fig. 2c) increased
11 linearly with increasing age ($R^2 = 0.91$, $P < 0.01$), from about 2 m at an age of six to about 9
12 m at an age of 25 years. The average baseline length of leaf petioles at the location of sensor
13 installation increased linearly with stand age ($R^2 = 0.65$, $P < 0.01$). As the number of leaves
14 was constant in mature stands, the increasing baseline lengths of leaf petioles resulted in a
15 significant linear increase of the water conductive area per palm with increasing stand age (R^2
16 $= 0.53$, $P < 0.01$). In consequence, the stand-level water conductive area also linearly
17 increased with stand age ($R^2 = 0.26$, $P = 0.05$; Fig. 2d).

18 **3.2 Transpiration and evapotranspiration**

19 Maximum sap flux densities on three sunny days as measured in the leaf petioles of oil palms
20 were variable but did not show a significant trend over age among the examined stands (Fig.
21 3a). Converted to leaf water use, a clear non-linear trend over stand age became apparent
22 ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.61$, $P < 0.01$ for the Hill function, see Morgan et al., 1975, fit shown in Appendix
23 Fig. 1b, not shown in Fig. 3b): Leaf water use increased 5-fold from a 2-year old stand to a
24 plot age of about 10 years; it then remained relatively constant with further increasing age. At
25 the palm level (Fig. 3c), water use rates closely resemble the relationship of leaf water use and
26 stand age. At the stand level, oil palm transpiration was very low (0.2 mm day^{-1}) in the 2-year
27 old stand and increased almost 8-fold until a stand age of 5 years. It then remained relatively
28 constant with increasing age at around 1.3 mm day^{-1} (Fig. 3d). However, three medium-aged
29 stands (PTPN6, BO5, and HO2) that showed increased sap flux densities and leaf and palm
30 water use rates also had higher stand transpiration rates, between 2.0 and 2.5 mm day^{-1} .
31 Potentially, this could be related to differences in radiation on the respective three sunny days

1 that were chosen for the analysis. However, there was no significant relationship between
2 average water use rates on the respective three sunny days in the 15 stands and the respective
3 average radiation (or VPD) on those days (linear regression, $P > 0.05$), i.e. observed
4 variability in transpiration among the 15 stands could not be explained by differences in
5 weather conditions. A further analysis of the water use rates of eight medium-aged stands
6 with highly variable transpiration rates also gave no indications of variability being induced
7 by differences in radiation. As for the leaf- and palm-level water use rates, a Hill function
8 explained the relationship between stand transpiration and stand age ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.45$, $P < 0.01$,
9 Appendix Fig. 1d), but the observed scatter was high, particularly among medium aged
10 plantations. Overall, stand transpiration rates increased linearly with increasing stand water
11 conductive area ($R^2 = 0.42$, $P = 0.01$). On the palm level, there was a linear relationship
12 between water use and trunk height ($R^2 = 0.32$, $P = 0.03$), but stand transpiration did not have
13 a linear relationship with average stand trunk height due to decreasing stand densities with
14 increasing stand age; instead, as for transpirations vs. stand age, a Hill function explained the
15 relationship between transpiration and stand trunk height best ($R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.44$, $P < 0.01$) (also
16 see summary in Table 2).

17 On comparably sunny days, the stand-level transpiration among the 15 oil palm stands varied
18 12-fold, from 0.2 mm day^{-1} in a 2-year old to 2.5 mm day^{-1} in a 12-year old stand. A large
19 part of this spatial variability was explained by different stand variables when applying the
20 Hill function. Stand age explained 45% of the observed spatial variability of stand
21 transpiration (i.e. $R^2_{\text{adj}} = 0.45$ at $P < 0.01$, Appendix Fig. 1), and variables correlated to stand
22 age, i.e. by average stand trunk height and by stand water conductive area, explained 44% and
23 43%, respectively (Table 2). Much of the remaining variability in stand transpiration rates
24 could be explained by varying stand densities (variations of up to 30% between stands of
25 similar age, see Table 1). Thus, when shifting from the stand level to the palm level, up to
26 60% of the spatial variability in palm water use rates could be explained by age and correlated
27 variables (see Fig. 3c and Table 2). Much of the variability that remains on the palm level is
28 induced by three stands where palm water use was much higher ($> 150 \text{ kg day}^{-1}$) than in the
29 other 12 stands ($< 125 \text{ kg day}^{-1}$); excluding these three stands from the analysis, 87% of the
30 spatial variability in palm water use rates could be explained by age (Table 3).

31 Evapotranspiration rates derived from the eddy covariance technique for the 2-yr-old stand
32 (PA) were 2.8 mm day^{-1} (average of three sunny days); the contribution of sap flux derived

1 transpiration was 8%. For the 12-year old stand (PTPN6), the evapotranspiration estimate was
2 4.7 mm day⁻¹; transpiration amounted to about 53%.

3 **3.3 Drivers of oil palm water use**

4 Radiation peaked between 12 and 1 pm while vapor pressure deficit peaked at around 3 pm;
5 the diurnal course of sap flux densities on three sunny days except for the 2-yr-old stand (PA)
6 showed an early peak of sap flux density (10 to 11 am), which then decreased throughout the
7 rest of the day (Fig. 4a and 4b, respectively). Thus, there was a varying and partly pronounced
8 hysteresis in the leaf-level response of transpiration to VPD (Fig. 4c). It was small in the 2-
9 year old stand (PA). In contrast, it was very pronounced in the 12-year old PTPN6 stand (high
10 water use, commercial plantation), where a very sensitive increase of water use rates with
11 increasing VPD during the morning hours was observed, reaching a peak in water use rates at
12 only about 60% of maximum daily VPD. After that, water use rates declined relatively
13 consistently throughout the day, despite further rises in VPD. The same pattern was observed
14 in most of the stands; we present values for the oldest stand (HAR_old, 25 years) and another
15 12-year old stand (BO3, low water use, smallholder plantation) as further examples. The
16 hysteresis in the transpiration response to radiation (Fig. 4d) was generally less pronounced
17 than for VPD.

18 The day-to-day behavior of oil palm leaf water use rates to environmental drivers (i.e. VPD,
19 radiation) seemed ‘buffered’, i.e. already relatively low VPD and radiation lead to relatively
20 high water use rates (except for in the 2-yr-old stand), while even strong increases in VPD
21 and radiation only induced rather small further increases in water use rates (Fig. 5). For the 2-
22 year-old stand (PA), leaf water use rates over time were almost constant (about 0.4 kg day⁻¹),
23 regardless of daily environmental conditions. Likewise, the water use rates of the remaining
24 stands were relatively insensitive to increases in VPD, i.e. two-fold increases in VPD only led
25 to 1.1- to 1.2-fold increases in water use rates (Fig. 5). A similarly buffered water use
26 response to radiation was observed for the 12-year old small-holder stand (BO3) and the 25-
27 year old stand (HAR_old), i.e. 1.5- and 1.3-fold increases, respectively, for two-fold increases
28 in radiation. The water use response to fluctuations in radiation of the 12-year old commercial
29 stand (PTPN6) was more sensitive, i.e. two-fold increases in radiation induced 1.8-fold
30 increases in water use rates (Fig. 5). The PTPN6 stand also had the highest absolute water use
31 rates among the studied stands.

32

1 **4 Discussion**

2 **4.1 Oil palm transpiration over age**

3 Among 13 studied productive oil palm stands (i.e. > 4 years old) stand transpiration rates
4 varied more than two-fold. The observed range (1.1–2.5 mm day⁻¹) compares to transpiration
5 rates derived with similar techniques in a variety of tree-based tropical land-use systems, e.g.
6 an *Acacia mangium* plantation on Borneo (2.3mm day⁻¹ for stands of relatively low density,
7 Cienciala et al., 2000), cacao monocultures and agroforests with varying shade tree cover on
8 Sulawesi (0.5–2.2 mm day⁻¹, Köhler et al., 2009, 2013) and reforestation and agroforestry
9 stands on the Philippines and in Panama (0.6–2.5 mm day⁻¹, Dierick and Hölscher, 2009;
10 Dierick et al., 2010). The highest observed values for oil palm stands (2.0–2.5 mm day⁻¹,
11 PTPN6, BO5, and HO2 stands) compare to or even exceed values reported for tropical forests
12 (1.3–2.6 mm day⁻¹; Calder et al., 1986; Becker, 1996; McJannet et al., 2007), suggesting that
13 oil palms can transpire at substantial rates under certain, yet unexplained site or management
14 conditions despite e.g. a much lower biomass per hectare than in natural forests (Kotowska et
15 al., 2015).

16 In the 15 studied oil palm stands, stand-level transpiration rates increased almost 8-fold from
17 an age of two years to a stand age of five years; they then remained relatively constant with
18 further increasing age but were highly variable among productive stands. In our study region,
19 oil palm plantations are commonly cleared and replaced at an age of max. 25–30 years due to
20 constrictions in fruit harvest with further increasing palm height; the oldest studied stand was
21 25 years old. In contrast to previous studies for dicot tree mono-cultural stands of varying age
22 we thus did not find, after a relatively early peak, lower stand transpiration rates with
23 increasing stand age (e.g. Jayasuriya et al., 1993; Roberts et al., 2001; Vertessy et al., 2001;
24 Delzon and Loustau, 2005). Asides from the productivity-related artificial short oil palm
25 lifespan in our studied stands as opposed to much larger time-scales in studies on tree stands
26 (e.g. comparison of 10- and 91-year old stands in Delzon and Loustau, 2005), this is also
27 related to differences in stand establishment: oil palms are commonly planted in a fixed,
28 relatively large grid, which results in a less pronounced reduction of stand density with
29 increasing stand age than in dicot tree stands, which are often established at much higher
30 stand densities and consequently show higher density-dependent mortality rates. After an
31 initial steep rise of transpiration at a very young plantation age, stand transpiration thus does

1 not seem to vary considerably over the life span of a certain oil palm plantation, which
2 contrasts with the water use characteristics of tree plantations.

3 The observed substantial stand-to-stand variability of transpiration among the 15 stands,
4 particularly among medium aged plantations, could to 60% be explained by the variables
5 stand age and density, and up to 87% when excluding three stands with much higher water
6 use. The remaining unexplained variability as well as the high water use rates in the three
7 mentioned stands could be related to differences in site and soil characteristics. However, all
8 studied stands were located in comparable landscape positions (i.e. upland sites of little or
9 medium inclination) and on similar mineral soils, i.e. loam or clay Acrisols of generally
10 comparable characteristics (Allen et al., 2015; Guillaume et al., 2015). Differences in
11 management intensity could also contribute to the remaining unexplained variability of stand
12 transpiration rates over age. E.g., on P-deficient soils such as the Acrisols of our study region
13 (Allen et al., 2015), fertilization can greatly increase oil palm yield (Breure, 1982) and thus
14 total primary productivity, which could consequently lead to a higher water use of oil palms.
15 Accordingly, the highest observed transpiration value in our study came from a stand in an
16 intensively and regularly fertilized, high yielding commercial plantation. Thus, there may be a
17 trade-off between management intensity, and hence yield, on the one hand, and water use of
18 oil palms on the other hand. This trade-off is of particular interest in the light of the
19 continuing expansion of oil palm plantations (FAO, 2014) and increasing reports of water
20 scarcity in oil palm dominated areas (Obidzinski et al., 2012; Larsen et al., 2014)

21 **4.2 Evapotranspiration and the contribution of transpiration**

22 Our eddy-covariance derived evapotranspiration estimates of 2.8 and 4.7 mm day⁻¹ (on sunny
23 days, in 2- and 12-year old stands, respectively) compare very well to the range reported for
24 oil palms in other studies: For 3–4 year old stands in Malaysia, eddy-covariance derived
25 values of 1.3 mm day⁻¹ and 3.3–3.6 mm day⁻¹ were reported for the dry and rainy season,
26 respectively (Henson and Harun, 2005). For mature stands, a value of 3.8 mm day⁻¹ was
27 given, derived by the same technique (Henson, 1999). Micrometeorologically-derived values
28 for 4–5 year old stands in Peninsular India were 2.0–5.5 mm day⁻¹ during the dry season
29 (Kallarackal et al., 2004). A catchment-based approach suggested values of 3.3–3.6 mm day⁻¹
30 for stands in Malaysia between 2 and 9 years old (Yusop et al., 2008); evapotranspiration
31 rates derived from the Penman-Monteith equation and published data for various stands were
32 1.3–2.5 mm day⁻¹ in the dry season and 3.3–6.5 mm day⁻¹ in the rainy season (Radersma and

1 Ridder, 1996). The values reported in most available studies as well as our values overlap in a
2 corridor from about 3 mm day⁻¹ to about 5 mm day⁻¹; this range compares to
3 evapotranspiration rates reported for rainforests in South East Asia (e.g. Tani et al., 2003a;
4 Kumagai et al., 2005). Considering that oil palm stands e.g. have much lower stand densities
5 and biomass per hectare than natural tropical forests (Kotowska et al., 2015), this indicates a
6 quite high evapotranspiration from oil palms at both the individual and the stand level.
7 Additionally to the previously discussed relatively high water use of oil palms under certain
8 site or management conditions, the high evapotranspiration from oil palm can be explained by
9 substantial additional water fluxes to the atmosphere. These fluxes (i.e. the differences
10 between evapotranspiration and transpiration estimates) were substantial in both the 2-year
11 old and the 12-year old oil palm stand, i.e. 2.6 and 2.2 mm day⁻¹, respectively. In the 2-year
12 old PA stand the contribution of palm transpiration to total evapotranspiration was very low
13 (8%, Fig. 6). The majority of water fluxes to the atmosphere came from evaporation (e.g. from
14 the soil, interception) and transpiration by other plants. The spaces between palms (planting
15 distance approx. 8 × 8 m) were covered by a dense, up to 50 cm high grass layer at the time of
16 study (approx. 60% ground cover); transpiration rates from grasslands can exceed those of
17 forests (e.g. review in McNaughton and Jarvis, 1983; Kelliher et al., 1992) and could well
18 account for 1–2 mm day⁻¹ to (partly) explain the observed difference of 2.6 mm day⁻¹
19 between evapotranspiration and transpiration estimates in the PA stand. The 2-year old oil
20 palms were still very small (average trunk height 0.3 m, overall height 1.8 m) and had a low
21 average number of leaves, 24 as opposed to 37 ± 1 (mean ± SD) between the 15 studied
22 stands; further, leaves were much smaller than in mature stands. Leaf area index (LAI) of 2-
23 year old oil palm stands was reported be at least 5-fold lower (LAI < 1) than in mature stands
24 of similar planting density as our study plots (Henson and Dolmat, 2003). The very low
25 observed water use of the oil palms in PA (12 kg day⁻¹ per palm compared to approx. 100 kg
26 day⁻¹ per palm in mature stands) and the consequent very low contribution of palm
27 transpiration to evapotranspiration thus do not seem contradictory. At PTPN6 (12 years old)
28 transpiration rates as well as the contribution of transpiration to evapotranspiration (53%)
29 were much higher than in the 2-year old stand (PA); also, total evapotranspiration was almost
30 70% higher. The sum of evaporation (e.g. from the soil) and transpiration by other plants was
31 of similar magnitude (2.2 mm day⁻¹, i.e. 15% lower) as in PA. Due to the intense
32 management, there was very little ground vegetation in inter-rows present in the PTPN6
33 stand. However, the abundant trunk epiphytes in butts of pruned leaf petioles that remain on
34 the trunks of mature oil palms may contribute significantly to non-palm transpirational water

1 fluxes. Additionally, oil palm trunks were reported to have a large potential external water
2 storage capacity (up to 6 mm, Merten et al., in revision) for stemflow water after precipitation
3 events; the mentioned butts of pruned leaf petioles constitute ‘chambers’ filled with humus,
4 water and epiphytes, which can remain moist for several days following rainfall events. On
5 dry, sunny days of high evaporative demand, the (partial) drying out of these micro-reservoirs
6 may significantly contribute to water fluxes from evaporation. This is supported by the
7 diurnal course of all water fluxes except oil palm transpiration at PTPN6 (calculated by
8 subtracting hourly transpiration from evapotranspiration rates), which closely followed VPD
9 until its 3 pm peak, but then declined rapidly. Generally, our comparison of eddy-covariance
10 derived evapotranspiration and sap-flux derived transpiration suggests significant other water
11 fluxes to the atmosphere than transpiration (e.g. from evaporation) that are still marginal
12 during the morning hours, reach their peak at the time VPD peaks and are extremely sensitive
13 to decreasing VPD in the afternoon. In our study, transpiration amounted to only 8% and 53%
14 of evapotranspiration in the two year-old and the 12 year-old oil palm stand, respectively,
15 which is lower than values reported e.g. for mature coconut stands (68%, Roupsard et al.,
16 2006) and rainforests in Malaysia (81–86%, Tani et al., 2003b). The low relative contribution
17 of palm transpiration to total evapotranspiration in oil palm stands could be due to relatively
18 high water fluxes from evaporation, e.g. after rainfall interception. Interception was reported
19 to be substantially higher in oil palm stands in the study region (28%, Merten et al., in
20 revision) than e.g. in rainforests in Malaysia (12–16%, Tani et al., 2003b) and Borneo (18%,
21 Dykes, 1997). The high water losses from interception paired with the relatively high water
22 use of oil palms and the consequent high total evapotranspirational fluxes from oil palm
23 plantations could contribute to reduced water availability at the landscape level in oil palm
24 dominated areas, e.g. during pronounced dry periods (Merten et al., in revision).

25 **4.3 Micro-meteorological drivers of oil palm water use**

26 At the diurnal scale, we examined the relationship between water use rates and VPD and
27 radiation (hourly averages of three sunny days, Fig. 4): In all examined oil palm stands except
28 the very young stand (PA, 2 years old), under comparable sunny conditions, the intra-daily
29 transpiration response to the mentioned environmental drivers was characterized by an early
30 peak (10am–11am), before radiation (12am–1pm) and VPD (2pm–3pm) peaked; after this
31 early peak of water use rates, however, they subsequently declined consistently throughout
32 the day, regardless of further increases of radiation and VPD (Fig. 4). For most thus far
33 examined dicot tree species, peaks in water use rates coincide with peaks in radiation (e.g.

1 Zeppel et al., 2004; Köhler et al., 2009; Dierick et al., 2010; Horna et al., 2011); however, a
2 similar behavior as in oil palms, i.e. early peaks of transpiration followed by consistent
3 declines, has been reported, but not yet explained, for *Acer rubrum* L. (Johnson et al., 2011)
4 and some tropical bamboo species (Mei et al., in review). Due to the early peaks, considerable
5 hysteresis in the oil palm transpiration response to VPD was observed in all examined stands
6 except for PA (2 years old). In studies on tree species, pronounced hysteresis has been
7 reported e.g. for eucalyptus trees in Australia during the dry season (O'Grady et al., 1999;
8 Zeppel et al., 2004) or for *Nothofagus fusca* Hook. f. on clear, but not on cloudy days
9 (Meinzer et al., 1997). The underlying eco-hydrological mechanisms remain yet unexplained;
10 potentially, the development of water stress (Kelliher et al., 1992), decreasing leaf stomatal
11 conductance and assimilation rates over the course of a day (Eamus and Cole, 1997; Williams
12 et al., 1998; Zeppel et al., 2004) or changes in leaf water potential, soil moisture content or
13 xylem sap abscisic acid content (Prior et al., 1997; Thomas et al., 2000; Thomas and Eamus,
14 2002) could play a role. For oil palms, no eco-physiological studies are available yet to assess
15 these potential underlying reasons for the observed pronounced diurnal transpirational
16 hysteresis. A contribution of stem water storage to transpiration in the morning could be
17 another potential explanation (Waring and Running, 1978; Waring et al., 1979, Goldstein et
18 al., 1998). It could explain the early peak followed by a steady decline of transpiration
19 regardless of VPD and radiation patterns, the decline being the consequence of eventually
20 depleted trunk water storage reservoirs. Other (palm) species were reported to have
21 substantial internal trunk water storage capacities (e.g. Holbrook and Sinclair, 1992;
22 Madurapperuma et al., 2009), which can contribute to sustain relatively high transpiration
23 rates despite limiting environmental conditions (e.g. Vanclay, 2009).

24 At the day-to-day scale, in all 15 oil palm stands, the response of water use rates particularly
25 to changes in VPD seemed 'buffered', i.e. near-maximum daily water use rates were reached
26 at relatively low VPD, but better environmental conditions for transpiration (i.e. higher VPD)
27 did not induce strong increases in water use rates (i.e. 1.2-fold increase in water use for a two-
28 fold increase in VPD). Likewise, for both photosynthesis rates (Dufrene and Saugier, 1993)
29 and water use rates (Niu et al., 2015) of oil palm leaves, linear increases with increasing VPD
30 were reported at relatively low VPD, until a certain threshold (1.5–1.8 kPa) was reached, after
31 which no further increases in photosynthesis and water use rates, respectively, occurred. For
32 tropical tree and bamboo species, more sensitive responses to fluctuations in VPD, i.e. 1.4- to
33 1.7-fold increases and more than two-fold increases, respectively, have been reported (e.g.
34 Köhler et al., 2009; Dierick et al., 2010, Komatsu et al., 2010). However, a similar 'levelling-

1 off' effect of water use rates at higher VPD, as observed for the oil palm stands in our study,
2 has been reported for Moso bamboo stands in Japan (in contrast to coniferous forests in the
3 same region, where water use had a linear relationship with VPD, Komatsu et al., 2010). The
4 hydraulic limitations 'buffering' the day-to-day oil palm water use response to VPD are yet to
5 be explained. As soil moisture was non-limiting, they are likely of micrometeorological or
6 eco-physiological nature. The early peaks of water use rates and the consequent strong
7 hysteresis to VPD on the intra-daily level, which may point to a depletion of internal trunk
8 water storage reservoirs early in the day as a possible reason for substantially reduced oil
9 palm water use rates at the time of diurnally optimal environmental conditions, give some
10 first indications of the direction that further studies could take.

11

12 **5 Conclusions**

13 The study provides first insights into eco-hydrological characteristics of oil palms at varying
14 spatial and temporal scales and first estimates of oil palm stand transpiration rates across an
15 age gradient. Stand transpiration rates increased almost 8-fold from an age of two years to a
16 stand age of five years and then remained constant with further increasing age, but were
17 highly variable among medium-aged plantations. In some of the studied stands, transpiration
18 was quite high, i.e. higher than values reported for some tropical rainforests. There may be a
19 potential trade-off between water use and management intensity of oil palm plantations. Total
20 evapotranspirational water fluxes from a two and a 12 year-old oil palm plantation were also
21 relatively high, i.e. other water fluxes besides transpiration (e.g. from the soil) contributed
22 substantially and variably to evapotranspiration. This reduced a 12-fold difference in
23 transpiration between the two stands to a less than two-fold difference in evapotranspiration.
24 In the diurnal course, most oil palms showed a strong hysteresis between water use and VPD.
25 On the day-to-day basis this results in a relatively low variability of oil palm water use
26 regardless of fluctuations in VPD and radiation. In conclusion, oil palm dominated landscapes
27 show some spatial variations in (evapo)transpiration rates, e.g. due to varying age-structures
28 and stand densities, but the day-to-day variability of oil palm transpiration is rather low.
29 Under certain site or management conditions, (evapo)transpirational water fluxes from oil
30 palms can be substantial.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 This study was supported by a grant from the German Research Foundation (DFG, CRC 990,
3 A02, A03). Furong Niu received a scholarship from the China Scholarship Council (CSC);
4 Afik Hardanto received a scholarship from the Indonesian-German Scholarship Program
5 (IGSP). The authors thank Pak Heri Junedi and Pak Agusta Herdhata for constructive
6 cooperation in the project. The authors also thank Surya Darma Tarigan for data on the
7 external trunk water storage capacity of oil palm trunks, Dodo Gunawan for providing long-
8 term climatic data and Martyna Kotowska for stand structural data. A big ‘Thank you!’ also to
9 everyone in Göttingen, Bogor and Jambi that made this work possible. Terimakasih!

10

11 **References**

- 12 Allen, K., Corre, M., Tjoa, A., and Veldkamp, E.: Soil nitrogen-cycling response to
13 conversion of lowland forests to oil palm and rubber plantations in Sumatra, Indonesia,
14 PLoS ONE, 10, e0133325, 2015.
- 15 Baldocchi, D.: Assessing the eddy covariance technique for evaluating carbon dioxide
16 exchange rates of ecosystems: past, present and future, *Global Change Biol.*, 9, 479–492,
17 doi: 10.1046/j.1365–2486.2003.00629.x, 2003.
- 18 Banabas, M., Turner, M. A., Scotter, D. R., and Nelson, P. N.: Losses of nitrogen fertiliser
19 under oil palm in Papua New Guinea: 1. Water balance, and nitrogen in soil solution and
20 runoff, *Aust. J. Soil Res.*, 46, 332–339, doi:10.1071/SR07171, 2008.
- 21 Barnes, A. D., Jochum, M., Mumme, S., Haneda, N. F., Farajallah, A., Widarto, T. H., and
22 Brose, U.: Consequences of tropical land use for multitrophic biodiversity and ecosystem
23 functioning, *Nat. Commun.*, 5, 5351, doi:10.1038/ncomms6351, 2014.
- 24 Becker, P.: Sap flow in Bornean heath and dipterocarp forest trees during wet and dry
25 periods, *Tree Physiol.*, 16, 295–299, doi:10.1093/treephys/16.1-2.295, 1996.
- 26 Breure, C. J.: Factors affecting yield and growth of oil palm tenera in West New Britain,
27 *Oléagineux*, 37, 213–227, 1982.
- 28 Calder, I. R., Wright, I. R., and Murdiyarso, D.: A study of evaporation from tropical rain
29 forest-West Java, *J. Hydrol.*, 89, 13–31, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(86)90139-3, 1986.
- 30 Cienciala, E., Kučera, J., and Malmer, A.: Tree sap flow and stand transpiration of two
31 *Acacia mangium* plantations in Sabah, Borneo, *J. Hydrol.*, 236, 109–120,
32 doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(00)00291-2, 2000.
- 33 Comte, I., Colin, F., Whalen, J. K., Grünberger, O., and Caliman, J. P.: Agricultural practices
34 in oil palm plantations and their impact on hydrological changes, nutrient fluxes and water
35 quality in Indonesia, in: *Advances in Agronomy Volume 116, Advances in Agronomy*,
36 Elsevier, 71–124, 2012.
- 37 Delzon, S. and Loustau, D.: Age-related decline in stand water use: sap flow and transpiration
38 in a pine forest chronosequence, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 129, 105–119,
39 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2005.01.002, 2005.

- 1 Dierick, D. and Hölscher, D.: Species-specific tree water use characteristics in reforestation
2 stands in the Philippines, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 149, 1317–1326,
3 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.03.003, 2009.
- 4 Dierick, D., Kunert, N., Köhler, M., Schwendenmann, L., and Hölscher, D.: Comparison of
5 tree water use characteristics in reforestation and agroforestry stands across the tropics, in:
6 *Tropical Rainforests and Agroforests under Global Change*, Tschardtke, T., Leuschner,
7 C., Veldkamp, E., Faust, H., Guhardja, E., Bidin, A. (Eds.), Environmental Science and
8 Engineering, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 293–308, 2010.
- 9 Drescher, J., Rembold, K., Allen, K., Faust, H., Jaya, N.S., Knohl, A., Meijide, A., Melati, D.,
10 Pérez-Cruzado, C., Steinebach, S., Wiegand, K., Qaim, M., Alamsyah, Z., Basir, M.,
11 Basri, Z., Buchori, D., Fauzi, A., Irawan, B., Malarisang, S., Siregar, I.Z., Rauf, A.,
12 Tasman, A., Tjoa, A., Zulkarnain, Z., Scheu, S and Kreft, H.: Ecological and
13 socioeconomic functions of tropical lowland rainforest transformation systems: an
14 integrative approach, in preparation, 2015.
- 15 Dufrene, E. and Saugier, B.: Gas exchange of oil palm in relation to light, vapour pressure
16 deficit, temperature and leaf age, *Funct. Ecol.*, 97–104, 1993.
- 17 Dykes, A. P.: Rainfall interception from a lowland tropical rainforest in Brunei, *J. Hydrol.*,
18 200, 260–279, 1997.
- 19 Eamus, D. and Cole, S.: Diurnal and seasonal comparisons of assimilation, phyllode
20 conductance and water potential of three *Acacia* and one *Eucalyptus* species in the Wet-
21 Dry tropics of Australia, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 45, 275–290, doi:10.1071/BT96020, 1997.
- 22 FAO: FAOSTAT online statistical service. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
23 Nations, Rome, Italy. Available via URL. [http:// http://faostat3.fao.org/](http://faostat3.fao.org/). (last access: 19
24 March 2015), 2014.
- 25 Goldstein, G., Andrade, J. L., Meinzer, F. C., Holbrook, N. M., Cavelier, J., Jackson, P., and
26 Celis, A.: Stem water storage and diurnal patterns of water use in tropical forest canopy
27 trees, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 21, 397–406, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1998.00273.x, 1998.
- 28 Granier, A.: Une nouvelle méthode pour la mesure du flux de sève brute dans le tronc des
29 arbres, *Ann. For. Sci.*, 42, 193–200, 1985.
- 30 Guillaume, T., Muhammad, D., and Kuzyakov, Y. (2015). Losses of soil carbon by
31 conversion of tropical forest to plantations: Erosion and decomposition estimated by
32 $\delta^{13}C$, *Glob. Change Biol.*, doi:10.1111/gcb.12907, 2015.
- 33 Henson, I. E.: Notes on oil palm productivity. IV. Carbon dioxide gradients and
34 evapotranspiration, above and below the canopy, *J. Oil Palm Res.*, 11, 33–40, 1999.
- 35 Henson, I. E. and Dolmat, M. T.: Physiological analysis of an oil palm density trial on a peat
36 soil, *J. Oil Palm Res.*, 15, 1–27, 2003.
- 37 Henson, I. E. and Harun, M. H.: The influence of climatic conditions on gas and energy
38 exchanges above a young oil palm stand in north Kedah, *J. Oil Palm Res.*, 17, 73–91,
39 2005.
- 40 Holbrook, N. M. and Sinclair, T. R.: Water balance in the arborescent palm, *Sabal palmetto*.
41 II. Transpiration and stem water storage, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 15, 4, 401–409, 1992.
- 42 Hollinger, D. Y., Kelliher, F. M., Schulze, E. D., and Köstner, B. M. M.: Coupling of tree
43 transpiration to atmospheric turbulence, *Nature*, 371, 60–62, doi:10.1038/371060a0, 1994.

- 1 Horna, V., Schuldt, B., Brix, S., and Leuschner, C.: Environment and tree size controlling
2 stem sap flux in a perhumid tropical forest of Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, *Ann. For. Sci.*,
3 68, 1027–1038, doi:10.1007/s13595-011-0110-2, 2011.
- 4 Jayasuriya, M., Dunn, G., Benyon, R., and O'Shaughnessy, P. J.: Some factors affecting water
5 yield from mountain ash (*Eucalyptus regnans*) dominated forests in south-east Australia,
6 *J. Hydrol.*, 150, 345–367, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(93)90116-Q, 1993.
- 7 Johnson, D. M., McCulloh, K. A., Meinzer, F. C., Woodruff, D. R., and Eissenstat, D. M.:
8 Hydraulic patterns and safety margins, from stem to stomata, in three eastern U.S. tree
9 species, *Tree Physiol.*, 31, 659–668, doi:10.1093/treephys/tpr050, 2011.
- 10 Kallarackal, J., Jeyakumar, P., and George S. J.: Water use of irrigated oil palm at three
11 different arid locations in Peninsular India, *J. Oil Palm Re.*, 16, 45–53, 2004.
- 12 Kelliher, F. M., Köstner, B., Hollinger, D. Y., Byers, J. N., Hunt, J. E., McSeveny, T. M.,
13 Meserth, R., Weir, P. L., and Schulze, E. D.: Evaporation, xylem sap flow, and tree
14 transpiration in a New Zealand broad-leaved forest, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 62, 53–73,
15 doi:10.1016/0168-1923(92)90005-O, 1992.
- 16 Köhler, M., Dierick, D., Schwendenmann, L., and Hölscher, D.: Water use characteristics of
17 cacao and *Gliricidia* trees in an agroforest in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, *Ecohydrol.*, 2,
18 520–529, doi:10.1002/eco.67, 2009.
- 19 Köhler, M., Hanf, A., Barus, H., and Hölscher, D.: Cacao trees under different shade tree
20 shelter: effects on water use, *Agrofor. Syst.*, 88, 63–73, 2013.
- 21 Komatsu, H., Onozawa, Y., Kume, T., Tsuruta, K., Kumagai, T., Shinohara, Y., and Otsuki,
22 K.: Stand-scale transpiration estimates in a Moso bamboo forest: II. Comparison with
23 coniferous forests, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 260, 1295–1302,
24 doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2010.06.040, 2010.
- 25 Kotowska, M. M., Leuschner, C., Triadiati, T., Meriem, S., and Hertel, D.: Quantifying
26 above- and belowground biomass carbon loss with forest conversion in tropical lowlands
27 of Sumatra (Indonesia), *Glob. Change Biol.*, doi: 10.1111/gcb.12979, 2015.
- 28 Kumagai, T., Saitoh, T. M., Sato, Y., Takahashi, H., Manfroi, O. J., Morooka, T., Kuraji, K.,
29 Suzuki, M., Yasunari, T., and Komatsu, H.: Annual water balance and seasonality of
30 evapotranspiration in a Bornean tropical rainforest, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 128, 81–92,
31 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2004.08.006, 2005.
- 32 Larsen, R. K., Jiwan, N., Rompas, A., Jenito, J., Osbeck, M., Tarigan, A.: Towards 'hybrid
33 accountability' in EU biofuels policy? Community grievances and competing water
34 claims in the Central Kalimantan oil palm sector, *Geoforum*, 54, 295–305, 2014.
- 35 Madurapperuma, W. S., Costa, W. de, Sangakkara, U. R., and Jayasekara, C.: Estimation of
36 water use of mature coconut (*Cocos nucifera* L.) cultivars (CRIC 60 and CRIC 65) grown
37 in the low country intermediate zone using the compensation heat pulse method (CHPM),
38 *J. Natn. Sci. Foundation Sri Lanka*, 37, 175–186, doi:10.4038/jnsfsr.v37i3.1211, 2009.
- 39 Mauder, M. and Foken, T.: Impact of post-field data processing on eddy covariance flux
40 estimates and energy balance closure, *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 15, 97–609,
41 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1127/0941-2948/2006/0167>, 2006.
- 42 McJannet, D., Fitch, P., Disher, M., and Wallace, J.: Measurements of transpiration in four
43 tropical rainforest types of north Queensland, Australia, *Hydrol. Process.*, 21, 3549–3564,
44 doi: 10.1002/hyp.6576, 2007.

- 1 McNaughton, K. G. and Jarvis, P. G.: Water deficits and plant growth: Predicting effects of
2 vegetation changes on transpiration and evaporation, Academic press, New York, 1983.
- 3 Mei, T., Fang, D., Röhl, A., Niu, F., Hendrayanto, and Hölscher, D.: Water use characteristics
4 of four tropical bamboo species derived from sap flux measurements, *Front. Plant Sci.*, in
5 review, 2015.
- 6 Meijide, A., Röhl, A., Herbst, M., June, T., Hölscher, D., and Knohl, A.: Water and energy
7 fluxes in oil palm plantations: effect of environmental variables and oil palm age, in
8 preparation, 2015.
- 9 Meinzer, F. C., Hinckley, T. M., and Ceulemans, R.: Apparent responses of stomata to
10 transpiration and humidity in a hybrid poplar canopy, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 20, 1301–1308,
11 doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1997.d01-18.x, 1997.
- 12 Merten, J., Röhl, A., Guillaume, T., Meijide, A., Tarigan, S., Agusta, H., Dislich, C., Dittrich,
13 C., Faust, H., Gunawan, D., Hein, J., Hendrayanto, Knohl, A., Kuzyakov, Y., Wiegand,
14 K., and Hölscher, D.: Water scarcity and oil palm expansion: social views and
15 environmental processes, *Ecol. Soc.*, in revision, 2015.
- 16 Morgan, P. H., Mercer, L. P., and Flodin, N. W.: General model for nutritional responses of
17 higher organisms, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 72, 4327–4331, 1975.
- 18 Niu, F., Röhl, A., Hardanto, A., Meijide, A., Köhler, M., Hendrayanto, and Hölscher, D.: Oil
19 palm water use: calibration a sap flux method and a field measurement of scheme, *Tree*
20 *Physiol.*, 35, 563–573, doi: 10.1093/treephys/tpv013, 2015.
- 21 Obidzinski, K., Andriani, R., Komarudin, H., and Andrianto, A.: Environmental and social
22 impacts of oil palm plantations and their implications for biofuel production in Indonesia,
23 *Ecol. Soc.*, 17, 25, 2012.
- 24 O'Brien, J. J., Oberbauer, S. F., and Clark, D. B.: Whole tree xylem sap flow responses to
25 multiple environmental variables in a wet tropical forest, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 27, 551–
26 567, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2003.01160.x, 2004.
- 27 O'Grady, A. P., Eamus, D., and Hutley, L. B.: Transpiration increases during the dry season:
28 patterns of tree water use in eucalypt open-forests of northern Australia, *Tree Physiol*, 19,
29 591–597, doi:10.1093/treephys/19.9.591, 1999.
- 30 Prior, L. D., Eamus, D., and Duff, G. A.: Seasonal trends in carbon assimilation, stomatal
31 conductance, pre-dawn leaf water potential and growth in *Terminalia ferdinandiana*, a
32 deciduous tree of northern Australian savannas, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 45, 53–69,
33 doi:10.1071/BT96065, 1997.
- 34 Radersma, S. and Ridder, N. de: Computed evapotranspiration of annual and perennial crops
35 at different temporal and spatial scales using published parameter values, *Agric. Water*
36 *Manage.*, 31, 17–34, doi:10.1016/0378-3774(95)01235-4, 1996.
- 37 Renninger, H. J., Phillips, N., and Hodel, D. R.: Comparative hydraulic and anatomic
38 properties in palm trees (*Washingtonia robusta*) of varying heights: implications for
39 hydraulic limitation to increased height growth, *Trees*, 23, 911–921, doi:10.1007/s00468-
40 009-0333-0, 2009.
- 41 Renninger, H. J., Phillips, N., and Salvucci, G. D.: Wet- vs. dry-season transpiration in an
42 Amazonian rain forest palm *Iriartea deltoidea*, *Biotropica*, 42, 470–478,
43 doi:10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00612.x, 2010.

- 1 Richardson, A. D., Hollinger, D. Y., Burba, G. G., Davis, K. J., Flanagan, L. B., Katul, G. G.,
2 Munger, J. W., Ricciuto, D. M., Stoy, P. C., Suyker, A. E., Verma, S. B., and Wofsy, S.
3 C.: A multi-site analysis of random error in tower-based measurements of carbon and
4 energy fluxes, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 136, 1–18, 10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.01.007, 2006.
- 5 Roberts, S., Vertessy, R., and Grayson, R.: Transpiration from *Eucalyptus sieberi* (L.
6 Johnson) forests of different age, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 143, 153–161, doi:10.1016/S0378-
7 1127(00)00514-4, 2001.
- 8 Rouspard, O., Bonnefond, J. M., Irvine, M., Berbigier, P., Nouvellon, Y., Dazat, J., Taga, S.,
9 Hamel, O., Jourdan, C., Saint-André, L., Mialet-Serra, I., Labouisse, J. P., Epron, D.,
10 Joffre, R., Braconnier, S., Rouzière, A., Navarro, M., and Bouillet, J. P.: Partitioning
11 energy and evapo-transpiration above and below a tropical palm canopy, *Agric. For.*
12 *Meteorol.*, 139, 252–268, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2006.07.006, 2006.
- 13 Ryan, M. G., Phillips, N., and Bond, B. J.: The hydraulic limitation hypothesis revisited, *Plant*
14 *Cell Environ.*, 29, 367–381, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.2005.01478.x, 2006.
- 15 Tani, M., Nik, A. R., Ohtani, Y., Yasuda, Y., Sahat, M. M., Kasran, B., Takanashi, S.,
16 Noguchi, S., Yusop, Z., and Watanabe, T.: Characteristics of energy exchange and surface
17 conductance of a tropical rain forest in peninsular Malaysia, in: Pasoh, Okuda, T.,
18 Manokaran, N., Matsumoto, Y., Niiyama, K., Thomas, S. C., Ashton, P. S. (Eds.),
19 Springer Japan, Tokyo, 73–88, 2003a.
- 20 Tani, M., Nik, A. R., Yasuda, Y., Noguchi, S., Shamsuddin, S. A., Sahat, M. M., and
21 Takanashi S.: Long-term estimation of evapotranspiration from a tropical rain forest in
22 Peninsular Malaysia, in *Water Resources Systems - Water Availability and Global*
23 *Change: Proceedings of an International Symposium (Symposium HS02a) Held During*
24 *IUGG 2003, the XXIII General Assembly of the International Union of Geodesy and*
25 *Geophysics: at Sapporo, Japan, International Assn of Hydrological Sciences, 30 June to*
26 *11 July, 2003, no. 280, pp. 267, , 2003b.*
- 27 Thomas, D. S. and Eamus, D.: Seasonal patterns of xylem sap pH, xylem abscisic acid
28 concentration, leaf water potential and stomatal conductance of six evergreen and
29 deciduous Australian savanna tree species, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 50, 229–236,
30 doi:10.1071/BT01045, 2002.
- 31 Thomas, D. S., Eamus, D., and Shanahan, S.: Influence of season, drought and xylem ABA
32 on stomatal responses to leaf-to-air vapour pressure difference of trees of the Australian
33 wet-dry tropics, *Aust. J. Bot.*, 48, 143–151, doi:10.1071/BT98090, 2000.
- 34 Vanclay, J. K.: Managing water use from forest plantations, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 257, 385–
35 389, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.09.003, 2009.
- 36 Vertessy, R. A., Watson, F. G., and O'Sullivan, S. K.: Factors determining relations between
37 stand age and catchment water balance in mountain ash forests, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 143,
38 13–26, doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(00)00501-6, 2001.
- 39 Waring, R. H. and Running, S. W.: Sapwood water storage: its contribution to transpiration
40 and effect upon water conductance through the stems of old-growth Douglas-fir, *Plant*
41 *Cell Environ.*, 1, 131–140, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.1978.tb00754.x, 1978.
- 42 Waring, R. H., Whitehead D., and Jarvis, P. G.: The contribution of stored water to
43 transpiration in Scots pine, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 2, 309–317, doi:10.1111/j.1365-
44 3040.1979.tb00085.x, 1979.

- 1 Williams, M., Malhi, Y., Nobre, A. D., Rastetter, E. B., Grace, J., and Pereira, M. G. P.:
2 Seasonal variation in net carbon exchange and evapotranspiration in a Brazilian rain
3 forest: a modelling analysis, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 21, 953–968, doi:10.1046/j.1365-
4 3040.1998.00339.x, 1998.
- 5 Yoder, B. J., Ryan, M. G., Waring, R. H., Schoettle, A. W., and Kaufmann, M. R.: Evidence
6 of reduced photosynthetic rates in old trees, *For. Sci.*, 40, 513–527, 1994.
- 7 Yusop, Z., Chong, M. H., Garusu, G. J., and Ayob, K.: Estimation of evapotranspiration in oil
8 palm catchments by short-term period water-budget method, *Malaysian J. Civ. Eng.*, 20,
9 160–174, 2008.
- 10 Zeppel, M., Murray, B. R., Barton, C., and Eamus, D.: Seasonal responses of xylem sap
11 velocity to VPD and solar radiation during drought in a stand of native trees in temperate
12 Australia, *Funct. Plant Biol.*, 31, 461–470, doi:10.1071/FP03220, 2004.
- 13 Zimmermann, M. H.: The monocotyledons: their evolution and comparative biology IV.
14 Transport problems in arborescent monocotyledons, *Q. Rev. Biol.*, 48, 314–321,
15 doi:10.1086/407593, 1973.

Table 1. Stand locations, characteristics and study periods

Plot code	Location/Village name (Jambi province, Indonesia)	Age (yrs)	Study region			Altitude (m)	Stand type (S = small holding, C = company)	Study period	Average radiation/VPD of three selected days (MJ m ⁻² day ⁻¹ /kPa)	Average radiation/VPD of the full measurement period (MJ m ⁻² day ⁻¹ /kPa)	Additional comments
			(H = Harapan, B = Bukit Duabelas)	Latitude (S)	Longitude (E)						
PA	Pompa Air	2	H	01°50'7.62"	103°17'44.22"	75	S	15 Oct 2013– 14 Jan 2014	21.6/1.4	16.6/1.1	Parallel eddy covariance measurements; same days used for analysis
HAR_yg	Bungku	3	H	01°55'38.5"	103°15'40.4"	63	S	28 Sep 2013– 24. Oct 2013	21.8/1.6	17.6/1.2	
BD_yg	Pematang Kabau	5	B	01°58'50.0"	102°36'18.4"	55	S	09 Jul 2013– 03 Aug 2013	17.4/1.5	12.3/1.2	
BO5	Lubuk Kepayang	9	B	02°06'48.9"	102°47'44.5"	65	S	01 Sep 2013– 22 Sep 2013	20.4/1.6	15.4/1.1	
HO4	Pompa Air	10	B	01°47'12.7"	103°16'14.0"	48	S	18 Jul 2013– 05 Aug 2013	19.9/1.4	16.0/1.0	
BO4	Dusun Baru	11	B	02°03'01.5"	102°45'12.1"	34	S	06 Aug 2013– 26 Aug 2013	22.9/1.8	17.6/1.4	
BO3	Lubuk Kepayang	12	B	02°04'15.2"	102°47'30.6"	71	S	03 Jul 2013– 30 Sep 2013	21.8/1.8	16.1/1.2	

PTPN6	PT. Perkebunan Nusantara 6	12	H	01°41'34.8"	103°23'27.6"	70	C	19 Jul 2014– 20 Dec 2014	19.7/1.4	16.7/1.1	Parallel eddy covariance measurements; same days used for analysis
BO2	Lubuk Kepayang	13	H	02°04'32.0"	102°47'30.7"	84	S	10 Jun 2013– 04 Jul 2013	24.9/2.1	20.5/1.7	
HO2	Bungku	14	H	01°53'00.7"	103°16'03.6"	55	S	25 Sep 2013– 19 Nov 2013	21.3/1.5	17.0/1.2	
HO1	Bungku	16	H	01°54'35.6"	103°15'58.3"	81	S	09 Aug 2013– 30 Aug 2013	22.3/1.9	18.5/1.5	
HO3	Pompa Air	17	H	01°51'28.4"	103°18'27.4"	64	S	07 Dec 2013– 19 Jan 2014	16.7/1.0	13.0/0.8	
PTHI	PT.Humusindo	18	H	01°57'43.2"	103°15'50.3"	59	C	15 Nov 2013– 04 Dec 2013	17.5/1.1	17.4/1.1	
BD_old	Pematang Kabau	22	B	01°57'22.4"	102°33'39.9"	73	S	14 Jul 2013– 30 Jul 2013	15.1/1.4	11.8/1.2	
HAR_old	Bungku	25	H	01°56'41.5"	103°16'41.9"	43	S	30 Sep 2013– 01 Nov 2013	21.1/1.6	17.1/1.2	

1 **Table 2.** Summary table of results for all 15 oil palm stands. R^2 and P values for linear
 2 regression and fitting a Hill function, respectively, are presented to explain variability in
 3 water use characteristics (i.e. maximum sap flux density, leaf water use, palm water use and
 4 stand transpiration) by the stand variables age, trunk height and sapwood area.

	Maximum sap flux density		Leaf water use		Palm water use		Stand transpiration	
	Linear fit	Hill function	Linear fit	Hill function	Linear fit	Hill function	Linear fit	Hill function
Age	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.16**	$R^2 =$ 0.31*	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.61**	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.59**	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.45**
Trunk height	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.15**	$R^2 =$ 0.37*	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.62**	$R^2 =$ 0.32*	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.61**	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.44**
Sapwood area	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.02**	$R^2 =$ 0.41**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.60**	$R^2 =$ 0.39**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.61**	$R^2 =$ 0.42**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.43**

5 * for $P \leq 0.05$, ** for the $P \leq 0.01$, n.s. for no significant relationship ($P > 0.05$).

1 **Table 3.** Summary table of results for 12 oil palm stands, i.e. excluding three stands of yet
 2 unexplained much higher water use (PTPN6, BO5, and HO2). R^2 and P values for linear
 3 regression and fitting a Hill function, respectively, are presented to explain variability in
 4 water use characteristics (i.e. maximum sap flux density, leaf water use, palm water use and
 5 stand transpiration) by the stand variables age, trunk height and sapwood area.

	Maximum sap flux density		Leaf water use		Palm water use		Stand transpiration	
	Linear model	Hill function	Linear model	Hill function	Linear model	Hill function	Linear model	Hill function
Age	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.16**	$R^2 =$ 0.67**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.86**	$R^2 =$ 0.63**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.87**	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.75**
Trunk height	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.13**	$R^2 =$ 0.60**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.82**	$R^2 =$ 0.56**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.86**	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.77**
Sapwood area	n.s.	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.01**	$R^2 =$ 0.68**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.80**	$R^2 =$ 0.64**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.85**	$R^2 =$ 0.61**	$R^2_{adj} =$ 0.69**

6 * for $P \leq 0.05$, ** for the $P \leq 0.01$, n.s. for no significant relationship ($P > 0.05$).

1 **Figure captions**

2 **Figure 1.** Locations of the studied oil palm stands in Jambi province, Sumatra, Indonesia.

3 **Figure 2.** The change of stand density (a), average number of leaves per palm (b), average
4 trunk height (c), and stand water conductive area (d) over age in the 15 studied oil palm
5 stands.

6 **Figure 3.** The change of maximum hourly sap flux density (a), average leaf water use (b),
7 average palm water use (c) and stand transpiration (d) over stand age. Data of the different
8 levels derived from simultaneous sap flux measurements on at least 13 leaves per stand;
9 values of three sunny days averaged.

10 **Figure 4.** Diurnal course of vapor pressure deficit (VPD) and radiation (R_g) (a) and of sap
11 flux density in four oil palm stands (b). Leaf water use plotted against hourly averages of
12 normalized VPD (c) and R_g (d). Average water use estimates based on at least 13 leaves
13 measured simultaneously; average water use rates, VPD and radiation of three sunny days,
14 each point represents one hourly observation. Data are from the locations PA (2 years old,
15 black arrows), BO3 (12 years old, low water use, red arrows), PTPN6 (12 years old, high
16 water use, blue arrows) and HAR_old (25 years old, green arrows). Data were normalized by
17 setting the maximum to one.

18 **Figure 5.** The day-to-day response of leaf water use rates in four different oil palm stands to
19 changes in average daytime vapor pressure deficit (VPD) (a) and integrated daily radiation
20 (R_g) (b) taken from the closest micrometeorological station from the respective plots. Data of
21 at least 20 days per plot, each point represents one day. Leaf water use rates are from the
22 locations PA (2 years old, black circles), BO3 (12 years old, low water use, red circles),
23 PTPN6 (12 years old, high water use, blue circles) and HAR_old (25 years old, green circles).
24 Significant linear relationships are indicated with solid ($P < 0.05$) and dotted ($P < 0.1$) lines,
25 regression functions are provided in the figure.

26 **Figure 6.** Normalized diurnal pattern of vapor pressure deficit (VPD), radiation (R_g),
27 transpiration (T) and evapotranspiration (E_T) in a 2-year-old (PA) (a) and a 12-year-old
28 (PTPN6) (c) oil palm stand; absolute hourly values of E_T and T in PA (b) and PTPN6 (d).
29 Eddy covariance and sap flux density measurements were conducted in parallel to derive
30 evapotranspiration and transpiration rates, respectively. Values of three sunny days averaged.

31 **Appendix Figure 1.** The change of maximum hourly sap flux density (a), average leaf water
32 use (b), average palm water use (c) and stand transpiration (d) over stand age. Data of the

- 1 different levels derived from simultaneous sap flux measurements on at least 13 leaves per
- 2 stand; values of three sunny days averaged. The provided fits are Hill functions (dotted lines).